

Applicant: Arnold Schneider
Serial No.: 10/826,857
Date: September 26, 2005

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 16, 2006, claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

However, for the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 16-23 includes features which are not suggested or rendered obvious by the cited references, taken in any permissible combination. Reconsideration is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10, and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nayar* in view of *Couillard* and further in view of *McNichols* and *Brennecke*. The Examiner contends that all the features of Applicants' invention set forth in these claims are suggested by a combination of features of these references.

However, it is respectfully submitted that any permissible combination of these references fails to disclose an ultrasonic horn configured as at least two rotating rollers which are arranged in tandem and offset to each other in the axial direction by an amount equal to a lambda-quarter wave of an imposed oscillation.

Each of the cited references is completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of an offset between the rollers in an axial direction equal to a lambda-quarter wave of an opposed oscillation.

Since this offset is unique, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention, as set forth in claims 1 and 23, and the claims depending from claim 1, includes features which are not suggested nor rendered obvious by the cited references, taken in any permissible combination.

Claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nayar* in view of *Couillard*, and further in view of *McNichols* and *Brennecke* and further in view of *Milnar*.

Applicant: Arnold Schneider
Serial No.: 10/826,857
Date: September 26, 2005

Page 7 of 7


However, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 includes all the features of claim 1. Since *Milnar* has been cited only for its teaching of bearings which permit rotation of the horn relative to the housing, it is respectfully submitted that the references, including *Milnar*, as combined by the Examiner, fails to teach or suggest the offset between the tandem rollers defined in claim 1.

Thus, for the same reasons set forth above for claim 1 for claim 1, which define the patentability of Applicants' invention in claim 1 over the cited references, in view of such reasoning, it is likewise submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 patentably defines over the cited references as combined by the Examiner.

In summary, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 16-23 includes features which are not suggested or rendered obvious by the cited references taken in any permissible combination. Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 16-23 are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance; a notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE,
WOOD & HELMHOLDT, P.C.



William M. Hanlon, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,422
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48064-3107

Dated: March 16, 2006

TDH/WMH/kl